

176

*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

Mr. Leonard: We are trying to get this case tried by Monday, your Honor.

The Court: That's all right. I know they filed a petition with Judge Tuttle to get another Judge down here. I know they did, because Judge Tuttle turned it down, and so I am going to stick right with this case until I get through with it, and in my own way.

Mr. Leonard: We were expecting Dr. Armstrong to come down to Savannah toward the end of next week.

The Court: Well, I am so glad you came down. All right, you may proceed.

---

[263] DR. CLAIRETTE P. ARMSTRONG, sworn for the interveners, testified as follows:

*Direct examination by Mr. Leonard:*

Q. Dr. Armstrong, would you state your background and employment up to the present? A. Well, do you want curriculum data, or what? I have a Ph.D. in Psychology.

Mrs. Motley: May it please the Court, as in the case of the other witnesses, we will stipulate that this witness is qualified to testify to whatever she testifies to.

The Court: All right, what do you say?

Mr. Leonard: Your Honor, I would like to have in the record some of Dr. Armstrong's qualifications.

The Court: If he wants it for the record in the event it goes to the Appellate Courts to show them who this lady is, her background, I think they are entitled to do that.

177

*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

Mr. Leonard: I won't exhaust the qualifications in view of the concession but I would like to get some of them, at least a sketch of her background.

The Court: All right, go ahead.

The Witness: Well, I'll begin with the Professional Chief Psychologist at Bellevue for two years, having interned for a whole year before, and then passing the Civil Service [264] Examination.

Q. What Degree do you hold? A. A.B. A.M. and Ph.D.

Q. Where did you take your Doctorate? A. New York University, finally.

Q. In what subject? A. Psychology.

Q. And did you take a Master's in the same subject? A. No. School of Political Science, the School of Social Work, counting as two minors.

Q. You've done both social work then and— A. —Well, no, I didn't do much in the line of social work, because my family objected.

Q. What were your fields in Psychology? A. Clinical. Clinical and consulting and research more recently.

Q. And what does Clinical Psychology mean? What does it cover? A. You are applying psychological laws to deviates of all sorts, or even normal people, of all ages, to diagnose what the trouble is and how they compare with normal people, so they can make a normal adjustment.

Q. Now, does this include work with students at [265] all? A. You mean normal—

Q. —Does this cover the adjustment of a student to his class or to his group? A. Well, as a private case, but you would expect people to be normal if they are working for college degrees or that sort of thing, if that's what you mean.

Q. All right, now, in primary and secondary schools? A. Young children.



*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

Q. Would the question of a person who doesn't fit his class group be a problem within the clinical psychology?  
A. Yes.

Q. That's what you are talking about? A. Yes.

Q. And, have you, in this field, published a number of studies in this area? A. Yes.

Mr. Leonard: Excuse me, Dr. Armstrong. I just wanted to say that, in view of the concession, instead of reading these, Your Honor, I will offer the list of Dr. Armstrong's articles in evidence as an exhibit, so they can be printed in the record and that will save time.

The Court: Any objections?

[266] Mrs. Motley: Well, I think he could put all of their testimony in and—

The Court: —I mean, do you have any objections to that particular evidence?

Mrs. Motley: No, sir.

The Court: All right, it is admitted without objections.

Mrs. Motley: Since all of his testimony as to this witness is all written out, why can't he just put that in evidence? Why go through all of this.

The Court: It is in evidence.

Mrs. Motley: What I am saying is that the evidence she is now going to testify to is all written out.

The Court: Is it written out in some report?

Mr. Leonard: This is just an outline for examination.

The Court: All right. He said he didn't have anything written out.

Mrs. Motley: What I am getting at, Your Honor, this list, as I understand it—

The Court: —her qualifications.

Mrs. Motley: Her qualifications, yes.

*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

The Witness: Publications.

The Court: Publications.

Mr. Leonard: These are her publications in this [267] field, your Honor.

Mrs. Motley: Publications on the subject to which you are now testifying?

The Witness: Not entirely.

The Court: All right, you may proceed.

Q. They are, however, publications within your general field of study? A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. Where did you take your B.A.? A. Barnard College, New York.

Q. And are you a member of any professional societies or a Fellow? A. I am a Fellow. Do you want a list. I am a Life Fellow of practically all of them in my field, Academy of Medicine, Association of Mental Defectives and all of those things.

Q. Thank you. Now, have you ever done clinical work actually on boys of student age, class room age? A. Yes, at the Childrens' Court.

Q. Now, based upon that experience and upon your studies, Dr. Armstrong, can you state what, in your opinion, would be the effect of congregating negro and white students in the same school?

Mrs. Motley: We object to that, your Honor.

[268] The Court: That is the same objection, is it not?

Mrs. Motley: I would like to have my objections in the record, your Honor.

The Court: I made a ruling to start with that you could raise your objections at the conclusion of the evidence and I will pass upon it at that time. Now, you talk about killing time, if we went into detail on this with every witness it would kill



*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

some time. You will be amply protected on that, and you can raise your objection after all the evidence is in and I will rule on it. I have made that ruling five or six times.

Mrs. Motley: Your Honor, it is going to be impossible for me to write down every question and answer of all of these witnesses.

The Court: I think you are capable of writing them down. You may proceed.

The Witness: Now, what was the question? I have forgotten the question.

The Court: I have forgotten the question, too. Just ask the question over again.

Mr. Leonard: Will the Reporter read my last question, please?

The Reporter: "Now, based upon that experience and upon your studies, Dr. Armstrong, can you state what, in your opinion, would be the effect of congregating negro and white [269] students in the same school and in the same class?"

A. I think it is very detrimental to the negro child.

Q. In what way, Dr. Armstrong? A. Scholastically, from the point of view of age, from the point of view of school abilities, and even though these children, the whites and the negro children are very low in their intelligences, the mental ages of the negroes is further below their chronological age than are the whites.

Q. In other words, when you take the lower end of the range you have— A. —the differences.

Q. Still a difference existing? A. They are all bad, but some are worse.

Mrs. Motley: I move that that remark be stricken.

The Court: What was that?

*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

Mrs. Motley: Her remark "They are all bad but some are worse", referring to negroes.

Mr. Leonard: I am sorry, but weren't you referring to both negro and white?

The Court: That's the way I understood it.

Mrs. Motley: I am sorry, but I thought you were referring to negroes only.

The Court: I understood she was referring to both. [270] Didn't you refer to both?

The Witness: Yes. You get the lower end of the scale.

Q. You are talking about delinquent boys, taken as a whole? A. Yes, the lower end of the scale.

Q. Your work has been done in the field of delinquent boys? A. And girls.

Q. And have any of those delinquents had school problems and has their delinquency been related to their school problems? A. Yes. Truancy, a tremendous proportion of the children in the children's court are truants, which means that there is some trouble there in the schools. They run away from home and a large proportion of them, 37% in the study I did of them, said they left because they couldn't get along in school, and then when you study their scholastic abilities on reading tests, arithmetic tests, you find them quite far down, quite far below their mental ages, five years below in some cases. These boys of fifteen couldn't even read a line and so you can see why they would run away.

Q. Tell me, Dr. Armstrong, you mentioned a figure there, did you question negro boys who were truants as to the cause of their truancy, or to the cause of their running away? [271] A. Yes, I asked a lot of them.

Q. And, what was that figure you gave? A. 37% of 660 runaway boys were negroes and that 30% of the



*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

children, of these negro boys, had run away because of the school situation.

Q. In other words, one-third of the negro truants were truants because of the situation existing in the school room? Now, where were these school rooms located? A. New York.

Q. New York City? A. Yes.

Q. And this is where your study was made? A. Yes.

Q. And this is the condition that exists in the New York City Schools where there are mixed classes? A. Yes.

Q. Now, when you say by their situation in the classes, do you mean the inability to keep up with the others, or what? A. Inability to learn. Teaching may be in the picture, but they just can't read and don't figure at the average for the age that these tests are standardized on. You see, they are way below.

Q. Well, what's the effect of that on the [272] students who are in a class with others who do? A. I have had them to tell me with tears in their eyes that they can't get along in school, that they know they are the dunces, so they run away. And, half the time, the families are bad, too, they have nothing.

Q. Would it have made any difference to these children, in your opinion, as a psychologist, if they had been in a class in which they were in a homogeneous group progressing at a rate which they could match? A. Oh, yes. And some of them are a little bit better in manual things, at that. In mechanical ability, they weren't normal. They were all far below, but they were better than in durable situations and scholastic situations.

Q. In other words, there is a difference in abilities here, which would have indicated a difference in course structure or treatment or trade school versus clerical school? A. Yes, but first, it is a regular pedagogical education. If they had manual training they might have done better, but even so, that wouldn't have prevented their running

*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Direct*

away, I suppose, because they were not just up to an average at that entirely.

Q. In other words, this was a school which was running ahead of their ability to learn? [273] A. All the schools are running ahead of the ability of a great many children.

Q. If you take a classroom which has identifiable groups of white and negro students, with different progress rates, would the type of reaction which you have just described tend to result? A. I think so, yes.

Q. Would there be any extent to which there would be a group identification with this result? A. I don't think so.

Q. To what extent, for example, would the individual feel a sense of frustration in his ability to do at least median class work? A. Well, it depends how many inferior children happen to be in that class, how many couldn't learn normally. You see, if they are conspicuously poor, if they can't read and they can't figure at all, can't add or subtract, that makes it very hard for them.

Q. What you are saying, essentially, is that failure to keep up with a class is a psychological cause for truancy and anti-social behavior, is that correct? A. Yes.

The Court: Is that correct?

The Witness: Yes.

[274] The Court: Talk so the Court Reporter can hear you.

The Witness: Yes.

Q. Now, have you at any time made a study in this field which you have reported in an article, or a book? A. Yes.

Q. And would you simply give us an identification of that, Dr. Armstrong? A. "A Note on the Attainments of Delinquent Boys," a study of 400 delinquent boys exactly 15 years of age, 200 whites and 200 negroes.



*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Cross*

Q. And this is listed in— A. —Yes, and then there is another one, too, and then there is “660 Runaway Boys.” That book is out of print now.

Q. These are the two articles you are referring to among the bibliography which was just published? A. Yes, and there is one I call “A Psychoneurotic Reaction of Delinquent Boys and Girls,” which is another study of runaway girls, comparing them with runaway boys, but not taking it racially, necessarily, though. The figures are there.

Q. Is there any difference between girls and boys? A. Yes, the girls are older for one thing, a [275] year older than the boys.

Q. Physical age, or chronological age? A. Physical age. They are older than boys. The boys were quite inferior. They averaged 15, and the girls averaged 14 years, very young to run away.

Q. Any difference in their mental ages? A. Oh, yes. Their average I.Q.’s are around 81 or 82, something like that, very near normal, but not between the boys and girls, there was no difference, about the same.

Q. That would be true. In other words, along with their chronological, or except for the difference in the chronological age? A. Yes.

Mr. Leonard: Thank you very much, Dr. Armstrong.

The Court: All right, you may cross-examine. You may proceed.

*Cross-examination by Mrs. Motley:*

Q. Dr. Armstrong, am I correct in understanding that your studies, to which you have just referred to, are studies of delinquent boys in New York City? A. Yes.

[276] Q. Am I correct in understanding that both negro and white boys were involved? A. Yes.

*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Cross*

Q. Have you ever made any studies of intellectually gifted children? A. Not to write them up as my own private cases.

Q. I see? A. I have seen a great deal of them and the differences are astonishing.

Q. Differences between what? A. Between the mentality of the gifted and bright. Would you like to have a case in point?

Q. No. I’m going to ask you another question. Is it your testimony that these intelligence differences are due to race? A. Well, it depends on what you mean by race?

Q. Well, it’s er— A. —Race is defined so differently in the courts’ statistics, for instance.

Q. Well, let me ask you this: Is it your testimony that negro children in Chatham County, Georgia, should not be admitted to schools with white children because negroes are inherently inferior? A. Well, the results show that they can’t keep [277] up with the averages of the whites, don’t they?

Q. That’s right, but what’s the reason for that? A. I am strongly on the organic side. I think it’s an innate, intrinsic ability. Of course, if they were brought up in a vacuum, even the bright ones wouldn’t succeed either, but in an average school situation the bright ones show their metal as a rule. The bright ones succeed as a rule.

Q. Do you think that negroes are innately inferior to whites, is that your testimony? A. There is a spread, of course, from lowest to highest, but the averages, on the average, the means are different, so that from my own experience, I would say that it is an inferiority.

Q. And on what do you base your conclusion that this is due to race? A. The mere fact that it occurs in all the literature and all the statistical studies, in all research, and in my own experience.

Q. Now, have you made any tests yourself which would show conclusively that this is race alone? A. I just said



*Dr. Clairette P. Armstrong—for Interveners—Cross*

“yes.” I would say it is race. There is nothing else that you can attribute it to. The study of 400 delinquent boys that I have quoted, 200 black and 200 whites, or 200 negroes, 200 whites, have shown it right [278] through scholastically, intelligence, and so forth.

Q. Now, do you know anything about the curriculum in the schools in Chatham County? A. No.

Q. So that you don’t know whether the negroes are getting an inferior education in Chatham County Schools or not, do you? A. I know that a child, a bright child, can teach itself to read, irrespective of anybody and everything. I have seen that happen.

Q. So, there is no need for any schools at all? A. Probably not, if they are bright.

Q. But the answer to the question is you don’t know anything about the Chatham County Schools, the type of education presently afforded to negroes in Chatham County, do you? A. My answer is that the bright child learns anyway.

Q. You said that before; but I want to know whether you know anything about the quality of education afforded negroes in Chatham County? A. No.

Q. Now, isn’t it a fact that students who get a poorer quality education, whether negro or white, will perform [279] on these tests in a poorer fashion than children in a superior quality school? A. That is so difficult to define that I don’t think I know what you mean by poor quality or superior quality because literature is full of criticisms of the way children are not taught to read today. So, probably your schools aren’t any worse than other schools.

Q. Well, what I am trying to get at is whether education in the schools has any effect on the achievement level? A. Could be.

Mrs. Motley: That’s all.

*Colloquy*

The Court: All right, any questions from you Savannah people?

Mr. Leverett: No questions.

The Court: All right, you may step down.

Mr. Leonard: Your Honor, at this time, I would like to call on Mr. Cowart to answer the Court on the question of the ROTC.

The Court: Yes. That’s what I asked yesterday to find out. The question was raised by one witness who stated that his purpose in going before the Board of Education, as I recall, the preacher, was to get his boy in the ROTC; that was his prime purpose, as I recall his testimony. Then the question was raised whether the Government had charge of the applicant [280] for the ROTC, whether it was under their administration, or whether it was under the administration of the Chatham Board of Education, and I asked some of you all to find out something about that by this morning.

Mr. Cowart: May it please the Court: I attempted to determine, and it is my information that they do not have any ROTC in Glynn County, and so I called Savannah and the information I have obtained was by telephone. I spoke to Major Myers, in Savannah, who is in charge of the Savannah area of the ROTC. He stated that the final decision was with the Department of the Army, as far as whether ROTC would go into a school or not. He stated that there were somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,000 schools in the United States who have made application, individual schools, who have made application for the ROTC Program and they have not been able to place ROTC in those schools.

The Court: Well, do they have ROTC in Savannah Schools?

Mr. Cowart: They do.